

Locality of percolation critical probabilities: uniformly nonamenable case

Song He, Xiang Kai-Nan and Zhu Song-Chao-Hao
 School of Mathematical Sciences, LPMC, Nankai University
 Tianjin City, 300071, P. R. China
 Emails: songhe@mail.nankai.edu.cn (Song)
 kainanxiang@nankai.edu.cn (Xiang)
 zsch61@qq.com (Zhu)

Abstract

Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of transitive infinite connected graphs with $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(G_n) < 1$, where each $p_c(G_n)$ is bond percolation critical probability on G_n . Schramm (2008) conjectured that if G_n converges locally to a transitive infinite connected graph G , then $p_c(G_n) \rightarrow p_c(G)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We prove the conjecture when G satisfies two rough uniformities, and $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable.

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a locally finite, connected infinite graph. Denote by $p_c(G)$ the critical probability for Bernoulli bond percolation on G , that is,

$$p_c(G) = \inf \{p \in [0, 1] : \mathbb{P}_p(\exists \text{ an infinite component}) > 0\}.$$

Here $\mathbb{P}_p = \mathbb{P}_{G,p}$ is the relevant product probability for p -Bernoulli bond percolation on G . *Notice that throughout this paper all graphs are assumed to be connected even if we don't mention this.*

Let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of all natural numbers, and $\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}_+$) the set of all (resp. nonnegative) integers. Denote by $B_G(v, R)$ the ball of radius $R \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ in G centered at v . To continue, let $\text{Aut}(G)$ be the set of all automorphisms of G . When $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts transitively on G , G is called transitive. Say G is spherically symmetric about its vertex o if for all pairs of vertices x, y at the same distance from o , there is an automorphism of G fixing o and mapping x to y . And for transitive G , G is spherically symmetric means it is spherically symmetric about some (in fact, any) vertex o .

Call a sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of transitive graphs converges locally to G if for any integer $R \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_{G_n}(v_n, R)$ and $B_G(v, R)$ are isomorphic as rooted graphs for all $n \geq N$, where v (resp. v_n) is an arbitrary vertex of G (resp. G_n). In the setting of general transitive graphs, there is a natural problem about the locality of percolations.

Problem 1.1 *Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of transitive infinite graphs which converges locally to a transitive infinite graph G . Does $p_c(G_n) \rightarrow p_c(G)$? In another word, is the value of p_c determined by the local geometry or by the global property of graphs?*

The answer to the problem is negative generally. For example, the following holds:

$$\text{As } n \rightarrow \infty, \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \text{ converges locally to } \mathbb{Z}^2,$$

but

$$1 = p_c(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \not\rightarrow p_c(\mathbb{Z}^2) < 1.$$

O. Schramm considered that Problem 1.1 should have a positive answer whenever the previous obstruction is avoided. The following conjecture is stated in [4] and attributed to Schramm (2008).

Conjecture 1.2 *Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of transitive infinite graphs with $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(G_n) < 1$ such that G_n converges locally to a transitive infinite graph G . Then $p_c(G_n) \rightarrow p_c(G)$.*

The project is supported partially by CNNSF (No. 11271204).

MSC2010 subject classifications. 60K35, 60C05, 82B43.

Key words and phrases. Percolation critical probability, locality, nonamenable transitive graph.

Whether $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(G_n) < 1$ is equivalent or not to $p_c(G_n) < 1$ for all n is unknown. Besides, $0 < p_c(H) < 1$ for any nonamenable transitive infinite connected graph H ; but no geometric characterization of the probabilistic condition $p_c(G) < 1$ has been established so far, which constitutes part of the difficulty of Conjecture 1.2. The conjecture suggests that the percolation critical probability is locally determined. This contrasts with critical exponents which are believed to be universal and depend only on global properties of the graph. For background and further conjectures regarding percolation on infinite graphs can refer to [5, 3, 16, 21].

For Conjecture 1.2, a related but not directly linked fact is the following: For large enough d , every vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ locally feels like in a $2d$ -regular tree T_{2d} ; Hara and Slade [15] proved that

$$p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d) = 1/(2d) + o(1/d) \text{ comes close to } p_c(T_{2d}) = 1/(2d - 1).$$

Recently, Delfosse and Zémor [8] studied Bernoulli bond percolation on m -regular hyperbolic tilings with $m \geq 5$, and derived an upper bound p_h of corresponding p_c . They conjectured $p_c = p_h$ ([8] Conjecture 7.2), which is a local property for critical probabilities of hyperbolic percolation in a sense close to above Conjecture 1.2.

The locality of the value of p_c is a natural and important question which attracts a lot of attention. For example p_c for slabs $\mathbb{Z}^d \times \{1, \dots, k\}^\ell$ (with $d \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 1$) approaches $p_c(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\ell})$. Grimmett and Marstrand [13] resettled this question positively by a block construction and renormalization argument. Though the just mentioned Grimmett-Marstrand's result is not in the setting of transitive graphs, as remarked in [4], from it, we see easily that as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$p_c(\mathbb{Z}^d \times (\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^\ell) \rightarrow p_c(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\ell}).$$

In [5], Benamini and Schramm studied the percolation properties in general setting of transitive graphs. In [4], Benamini, Nachmias and Peres showed that the percolation is local geometry for non-amenable graphs with large girth; namely, Conjecture 1.2 holds when G is a d -regular tree T_d with $d \geq 3$ and $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable. Here uniform nonamenability of $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and spherically symmetrical tree-structure of T_d play an important role. Martineau and Tassion [18] proved Conjecture 1.2 in case of Cayley graphs of Abel groups with rank no less than 2 by making the Grimmett-Marstrand argument more robust. Note in [13] and [18], the graphs are assumed to be amenable. And the conjecture is still open even for uniformly nonamenable sequences $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ([4]).

As mentioned in Pete [21] Section 14.2, Conjecture 1.2 appears to be quite hard. Generally, in [21] Section 14.2, Pete proved one direction of the Schramm conjecture that

$$p_c(G) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_c(G_n) \tag{1.1}$$

by the following result: For Bernoulli bond percolation on any infinite transitive graph H with that $p_c(H) < 1 - \delta$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there is a positive constant $c(\delta)$ only depending on δ such that

$$\theta_H(p) - \theta_H(p_c(H)) \geq c(\delta)(p - p_c(H)), \quad \forall p \in (p_c(H), 1];$$

where $\theta_H(p) = \mathbb{P}_{H,p}[\text{cluster of } o \text{ is infinite}]$ and o is a fixed vertex of H . For a discuss of the other direction of the conjecture, refer to [21] Section 14.2.

To state our main result, we introduce the following definition of “quasi-spherically symmetric”.

Definition 1.3 (i) *Call a graph H is quasi-spherically symmetric about its vertex o if there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\partial B_H(o, n) := B_H(o, n) \setminus B_H(o, n-1)$ can be divided into at most k disjointed subsets with that for any two vertices x and y in the same subset, there is an automorphism of H fixing o and mapping x to y .*

(ii) *And for transitive H , H is quasi-spherically symmetric means it is quasi-spherically symmetric about some (in fact, any) vertex o .*

Clearly, for a graph H , spherical symmetry implies quasi-spherical symmetry. Note any d -regular tree T_d with $d \geq 2$ is a spherically symmetric Cayley graph and any Cayley graph is symmetric, and Cayley graphs are rarely spherically symmetric. However, there still are some spherically symmetric Cayley graphs rather than regular trees; and there are some quasi-spherically symmetric transitive graphs which are not spherically symmetric. See Section 2.

Given an infinite transitive graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ and a simple random walk (SRW) $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ on it. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in V(G)$, $x \in \partial B_G(u, n)$, $p \in (p_c(G), 1)$, let $\sigma_n = \inf\{t \mid X_t \notin B_G(X_0, n)\}$ and

$$\mu_n(x) = \mathbb{P}[X_{\sigma_n} = x \mid X_0 = u], \quad b_n(x, u) = \mathbb{P}_{G,p}[x \text{ is connected to } u \text{ in } B_G(u, n)]. \quad (1.2)$$

Notice $\mu_n(\cdot)$ and $b_n(\cdot, u)$ depend on u , while the following assumption is independent of u .

Assumption 1.4 (*Rough uniformity*) (i) *There exist $0 < c, C < \infty$ such that*

$$c \leq \frac{\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(y)} \leq C, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall x, y \in \partial B_G(u, n).$$

(ii) *There are positive constants $c_1(p)$ and $c_2(p)$ depending on p satisfying*

$$c_1(p) \leq b_n(x, u)/b_n(y, u) \leq c_2(p), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall x, y \in \partial B_G(u, n).$$

Note that Conjecture 1.2 is open even if we assume $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable ([4] p.202 lines -2 and -1) and appears to be quite hard ([21] Section 14.2). In this paper, we prove

Theorem 1.5 *Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of uniformly nonamenable transitive infinite graphs converging locally to a transitive infinite graph G . If G satisfies Assumption 1.4, then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$p_c(G_n) \rightarrow p_c(G).$$

By (4.1), local limit of any sequence of uniformly nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs is nonamenable. Clearly, Assumption 1.4 holds for any spherically symmetric transitive infinite connected graph. Naturally, Assumption 1.4 should be true for many quasi-spherically symmetric transitive infinite connected graphs. For spherically or quasi-spherically symmetric and nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs which are not trees and satisfy Assumption 1.4, see Section 2. Assumption 1.4 is a technical condition which should be removed, and we can not remove it in this paper. We conjecture that Assumption 1.4 holds for quasi-spherically symmetric transitive graphs.

Remark 1.6 *Novel aspects of this paper are as follows.*

(i) *Introduce a notion of quasi-spherically symmetric graphs and find some examples of such nonamenable graphs satisfying Assumption 1.4 with uniformly nonamenable local approximations.*

(ii) *Our proof of Theorem 1.5 is inspired by [4]. Comparing with [4], in our setting, the loop erasure of $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^{\sigma_n}$ can not be a uniform random non-backtracking (self-avoiding) path, [4] Corollary 3.1 does not hold, we introduce notion (α, A, n) -nice instead of [4] (α, A) -good. And ingeniously, when considering the bond percolation on G_n in Step 1 of proof for Lemma 3.3, we introduce a third family $\{Z_e(\epsilon_1)\}_{e \in E(G_n)}$ of independent Bernoulli random variables with mean ϵ_1 , which is independent of $\{X_e(p)\}_{e \in E(G_n)}$ and $\{Y_e(\epsilon)\}_{e \in E(G_n)}$; and add vertices into $\mathcal{V}_t$ not only according to Case 1 like [4], but also according to Case 2 which differs from that of [4]. And in order that conditional expectation of $|\mathcal{V}_t|$ can be as big as possible, we need to estimate the conditional probability of a vertex being in $\mathcal{V}_t$ has a not too small lower bound specified in (3.4); which is done in Step 3 of proving Lemma 3.3. Note Assumption 1.4 is used to deduce (3.2)-(3.3) in Step 2 of proof for Lemma 3.3, which does not appear in [4]. The Steps 2 and 3 are essentially new. Step 4 in proving Lemma 3.3 is the same as that of [4].*

2 Quasi-spherically symmetric nonamenable transitive graphs

In this section we will present some examples for nonamenable quasi-spherically symmetric graphs (including spherically symmetric ones) satisfying Assumption 1.4 with uniformly nonamenable local approximations. As mentioned before, d -regular tree T_d is spherically symmetric and nonamenable for any $d \geq 3$.

Lemma 2.1 *Given a nonamenable right Cayley graph H corresponding to a group Γ , and a sequence $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \Gamma$ such that (i) $|r_n|$, the distance of r_n from the identity of Γ , converges to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; (ii) additionally when order of r_n is infinite, for some positive constant c_n , $|r_n^k| \geq c_n |k| |r_n|$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let each H_n be the transitive quotient graph of H given by the following equivalence:*

$$x, y \in \Gamma, \quad x \sim_n y \iff x^{-1}y \in \{r_n^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \langle r_n \rangle;$$

i.e., the $\langle r_n \rangle$ -left-coset Cayley graph. Then $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable and locally convergent to H .

Proof. For any $h \in H$, let $\text{ord}(h)$ be its order. Note

$$p_{H_n}^j([x]_n, [x]_n) = \sum_{k=-\text{ord}(r_n)+1}^{\text{ord}(r_n)-1} p_H^j(x, xr_n^k),$$

where $[x]_n$ is the quotient image of x , and $p_{H_n}^j(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $p_H^j(\cdot, \cdot)$ are j -step transition probabilities for SRW on H_n and H respectively. By [21] Chapter 1 Theorem 1.4, we see that

$$p_H^j(x, xr_n^k) \leq 2\rho^j e^{-\frac{|r_n^k|^2}{2j}}.$$

Here $\rho = \rho(H)$ is the spectral radius of H .

Therefore, when $\text{ord}(r_n) = \infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{H_n}^j([x]_n, [x]_n) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} p_H^j(x, xr_n^k) \leq p_H^j(x, x) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 4\rho^j e^{-\frac{k^2 c_n^2 |r_n|^2}{2j}} \\ &\leq 2\rho^j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} 4\rho^j + \sum_{k \geq j+1} 4\rho^j e^{-\frac{k c_n^2 |r_n|^2}{2}} \leq \rho^j \left(2 + 4j + 4 \sum_{k \geq j+1} e^{-\frac{k c_n^2 |r_n|^2}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq \rho^j \left(2 + 4j + 4 \frac{e^{-\frac{(j+1)c_n^2 |r_n|^2}{2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{c_n^2 |r_n|^2}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(p_{H_n}^j([x]_n, [x]_n) \right)^{\frac{1}{j}} \leq \rho$. Obviously, $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(p_{H_n}^j([x]_n, [x]_n) \right)^{\frac{1}{j}} \geq \rho$. Namely, the spectral radius $\rho(H_n)$ of H_n is ρ .

And when $\text{ord}(r_n) < \infty$, we see that

$$p_{H_n}^j([x]_n, [x]_n) = \sum_{k=-\text{ord}(r_n)+1}^{\text{ord}(r_n)-1} p_H^j(x, xr_n^k) \leq \sum_{k=-\text{ord}(r_n)+1}^{\text{ord}(r_n)-1} 2\rho^j \leq 2(2\text{ord}(r_n) - 1)\rho^j,$$

which implies $\rho(H_n) \leq \rho$, and further $\rho(H_n) = \rho$.

Clearly $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges locally to H due to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |r_n| = \infty$. ■

Let P be the transition matrix of an SRW on a connected graph H and I the identity matrix, the bottom $\lambda_1(H)$ of the spectrum of $I - P$ is the largest constant λ_1 such that for all $f \in \ell^2(H, \deg(\cdot))$, we have

$$\langle f, (I - P)f \rangle \geq \lambda_1 \langle f, f \rangle.$$

Here degree function $\deg(\cdot)$ is viewed as a stationary measure for the SRW on H , and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on $\ell^2(H, \deg(\cdot))$. Notice that when H is transitive, $\ell^2(H, \deg(\cdot))$ can be replaced by $\ell^2(H)$. Recall Dodziuk [10] proved that an infinite bounded degree connected graph is nonamenable if and only if $\lambda_1(H) > 0$.

Example 2.2 *Modified grandparent graphs*

Fix $3 \leq d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let ξ be a fixed end of d -regular tree T_d . For any vertex x of T_d , there is a unique ray $x_\xi = \langle x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle$ starting at x such that x_ξ and y_ξ differ by only finitely many vertices for any vertices x and y . Call x_2 is the ξ -grandparent of x . Let H be the graph obtained from T_d by adding the edge xx_2 between each x and its ξ -grandparent. Note that H is a transitive graph but not a Cayley graph of any group. See [16] Section 7.1. *Given any vertex o of T_d .* Boundaries $\partial B_H(o, n)$ of balls $B_H(o, n)$ are very complicated: When one walks in H , he can at each step decide to take (i) a “grandparent step”, which goes further, but only in a specific direction, (ii) or a usual step, which can go in any direction one wants. This makes that H is not quasi-spherically symmetric. We are grateful that G. Kozma pointed this to us.

But the following transitive *modified grandparent graph* G is quasi-spherically symmetric and satisfies Assumption 1.4: Let $\text{dist}_{T_d}(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the graph distance in T_d . And add new edges between any two vertices x and y of T_d with $\text{dist}_{T_d}(x, y) = 2$. Denote the obtained graph by G .

Indeed, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$S_1^n = \{x \in T_d \mid \text{dist}_{T_d}(o, x) = 2n - 1\}, \quad S_2^n = \{x \in T_d \mid \text{dist}_{T_d}(o, x) = 2n\}.$$

Then

$$\partial B_G(o, n) = S_1^n \cup S_2^n.$$

Obviously, for every pair vertices x and y in S_1^n (resp. S_2^n), there is an automorphism fixing o and mapping x to y due to the spherical symmetry of T_d . Hence G is quasi-spherically symmetric.

Let P and P_1 be the transition matrices of SRWs on G and T_d respectively. Let $P_2 = (p_2(x, y))_{x, y}$ be transition matrix on G such that

$$p_2(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \text{dist}_{T_d}(x, y) \neq 2, \\ \frac{1}{d(d-1)}, & \text{if } \text{dist}_{T_d}(x, y) = 2. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$P = \frac{d}{d^2} P_1 + \frac{d(d-1)}{d^2} P_2 = \frac{1}{d} P_1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right) P_2.$$

Note T_d is nonamenable, $\lambda_1(T_d) > 0$. Thus for any $f \in \ell^2(G) = \ell^2(T_d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, (I - P)f \rangle &= \frac{1}{d} \langle f, (I - P_1)f \rangle + \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right) \langle f, (I - P_2)f \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{1}{d} \lambda_1(T_d) \langle f, f \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Namely, G is nonamenable.

Since T_d is the right Cayley graph of group $\langle a_1, \dots, a_d \mid a_i^2, 1 \leq i \leq d \rangle$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $T_d^{(n)}$ be the $\langle (a_1 a_2)^{n+1} \rangle = \{(a_1 a_2)^{k(n+1)} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ left-coset Cayley graph. Then $\{T_d^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable by Lemma 2.1. (There are other uniformly nonamenable local approximations to T_d . In fact, for any group Γ_k ($k \geq 2$), Olshanskii and Sapir [20] constructed a uniformly nonamenable sequence which converges locally to its Cayley graph. For $k \geq 4$, Akhmedow [2] also gave such a sequence.)

Note each $T_d^{(n)}$ is a quotient graph of T_d , and the modified grandparent graph G of T_d induces naturally a modified grandparent graph G_n of $T_d^{(n)}$. Clearly, $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges locally to G . Similarly to prove G is nonamenable, one can check each G_n is also nonamenable and

$$\lambda_1(G_n) \geq \frac{1}{d} \lambda_1(T_d^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{d} \inf_{k \geq 1} \lambda_1(T_d^{(k)}) > 0.$$

Hence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable.

Note that $\mu_n(\cdot)$ is a constant function on S_1^n or S_2^n . To prove Assumption 1.4(i), it suffices to check

$$\mu_n(x) \geq \mu_n(y) \geq \frac{1}{d^2} \mu_n(x), \quad x \in S_1^n, \quad y \in S_2^n, \quad x \sim y, \quad n \geq 2.$$

To begin, let

$$\Gamma_{x,z} = \{\text{path } \gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k : k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma_0 = o, \gamma_k = x, \gamma_{k-1} = z, \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{k-1} \subseteq B_G(o, n-1)\},$$

$$\Gamma_{x,w} = \{\text{path } \gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k : k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma_0 = o, \gamma_k = x, \gamma_{k-1} = w, \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{k-1} \subseteq B_G(o, n-1)\},$$

where z and w are parent and grandparent of x respectively (assuming o is the ancestor of all other vertices of T_d), see Figure 1. And let

$$\Gamma_{y,z} = \{\text{path } \gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k : k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma_0 = o, \gamma_k = y, \gamma_{k-1} = z, \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{k-1} \subseteq B_G(o, n-1)\}.$$

For path $\gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k$, write $|\gamma| = k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(x) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,z}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2}\right)^{|\gamma|} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,w}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2}\right)^{|\gamma|}, \\ \mu_n(y) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{y,z}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2}\right)^{|\gamma|}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $\gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k \in \Gamma_{x,z}$, $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{k-1} y \in \Gamma_{y,z}$; and for any $\beta = \beta_0 \beta_1 \cdots \beta_\ell \in \Gamma_{x,w}$, $\tilde{\beta} = \beta_0 \beta_1 \cdots \beta_{\ell-1} z y \in \Gamma_{y,z}$; we have that

$$\mu_n(y) \geq \frac{1}{d^2} \mu_n(x).$$

On the other hand, for any $\gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k \in \Gamma_{y,z}$, $\bar{\gamma} = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{k-1} x \in \Gamma_{x,z}$. So

$$\mu_n(x) \geq \mu_n(y).$$

Notice that $b_n(\cdot, o)$ is a constant function on S_1^n or S_2^n ; and for any $x \in S_1^n$ (resp. S_2^n), there is an its neighbour $y \in S_2^n$ (resp. S_1^n). Then $b_n(x_1, o) \geq p b_n(x_2, o)$ and $b_n(x_2, o) \geq p b_n(x_1, o)$ for any $x_1 \in S_1^n$ and $x_2 \in S_2^n$. Hence

$$p \leq \frac{b_n(x, o)}{b_n(y, o)} \leq \frac{1}{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in \partial B_G(o, n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Assumption 1.4(ii) holds. ■

Example 2.3 $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3 \cong \langle a, b | a^2, b^3 \rangle$, where $*$ denotes the free product.

Cayley graph of above group is shown as Figure 2. Given a root o , there are only two ways to connect $\partial B_G(o, n)$ with $\partial B_G(o, n-1)$ for any $n \geq 1$. Thus G is quasi-spherically symmetric. Note [23] Chapter 2 Theorem 10.10: Let $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be a degree bounded connected infinite graph such that for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $H \setminus B_H(x, r)$ has at least three infinite connected components for any $x \in V(H)$. Then H is nonamenable. By this result, $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$ and G are nonamenable.

Let G_n be the $\langle (ab)^n \rangle = \{(ab)^{kn} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ left-coset Cayley graph. Then $\{G_n\}_{n=2}^\infty$ converges locally to G ; and by Lemma 2.1, $\{G_n\}_{n=2}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable.

Notice Figure 2. Given any $x, y \in \partial B_G(o, n)$. If x, y are of the same type, then

$$\mu_n(x) = \mu_n(y) \text{ and } b_n(x, o) = b_n(y, o).$$




Figure 1: Local structure of *modified grandparent graph* drawn in plane

Otherwise, without loss of generality, assume x is of type 2 and y is of type 1. And we can find a type 2 vertex $z \in \partial B_G(o, n-1)$ and $y \sim z$. Clearly,

$$\mu_n(y) \leq \mu_{n-1}(z) \text{ and } b_n(y, o) \leq b_{n-1}(z, o).$$

Note that

$$\mu_n(x) \geq \frac{1}{3}\mu_{n-1}(z) \text{ and } b_n(x, o) \geq pb_{n-1}(z, o).$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mu_n(x) \geq \frac{1}{3}\mu_n(y) \text{ and } b_n(x, o) \geq pb_n(y, o).$$

Exchanging positions of x and y , we have that

$$\mu_n(y) \geq \frac{1}{3}\mu_n(x) \text{ and } b_n(y, o) \geq pb_n(x, o).$$

Hence for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in \partial B_G(o, n)$,

$$\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(y)} \leq 3 \text{ and } p \leq \frac{b_n(x, o)}{b_n(y, o)} \leq \frac{1}{p};$$

Assumption 1.4 holds. ■

Example 2.4 $H_1 * H_2 * \cdots * H_m$ ($2 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$). Here each $H_i = \langle S_i | R_i \rangle$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) is a nontrivial finite group; and when $m = 2$, $\max\{|H_1|, |H_2|\} \geq 3$.

Cayley graph G of $H_1 * H_2 * \cdots * H_m$ is quasi-spherically symmetric. The reason is as follows: there are finitely many ways for connecting $\partial B_G(o, n)$ and $\partial B_G(o, n-1)$ for all $n \geq 1$, where o is a fixed vertex of G . From [23] Chapter 2 Theorem 10.10, G is nonamenable.

Similarly to Example 2.3, by Lemma 2.1, we can construct many uniformly nonamenable graph sequences $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of infinite transitive connected graphs to locally approximate G . And also similarly to Example 2.3, we can check Assumption 1.4 holds for G . ■




Figure 2: Local structure of Cayley graph for $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$

Example 2.5 For any composite natural number $d \geq 4$, there exist d -regular spherically symmetric nonamenable infinite Cayley graphs G which are not d -regular tree T_d .

Since d is a composite number, there exist $2 \leq m, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d = mk$. Note complete graph $\mathbb{K}_{k+1}$ on $k+1$ vertices is a right Cayley graph of some finitely generated group $\langle S_1 | R_1 \rangle$. Let G be the right Cayley graph of group $H = \langle S_1 | R_1 \rangle * \langle S_1 | R_1 \rangle * \cdots * \langle S_1 | R_1 \rangle$ (m copies). Then G is a spherically symmetric nonamenable infinite Cayley graph. And spherical symmetry is obviously. Indeed, for any $x \in V(G)$ and $r \geq 1$, $G \setminus B_G(x, r)$ will give birth at least mk^{r-1} infinite connected components; by [23] Chapter 2 Theorem 10.10, G is nonamenable.

Recall from Lyons and Peres [16] Section 3.5, a Cayley graph is spherically symmetric iff it is 2-point homogeneous (i.e., distance transitive [17]) in the sense that there is an automorphism taking u to w and v to x for any vertices u, v, w, x with $\text{dist}(u, v) = \text{dist}(w, x)$; where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the graph distance. It is still true that an infinite transitive graph L is spherically symmetric iff it is 2-point homogeneous. In fact, assume transitive L is spherically symmetric and given any vertices u, v, w, x with $\text{dist}(u, v) = \text{dist}(w, x)$. Firstly there is an automorphism ϕ_1 of L taking u to w , and then there is an automorphism ϕ_2 of L fixing w and mapping $\phi_1(v)$ to x . Clearly, automorphism $\phi_2 \circ \phi_1$ of L takes u to w and v to x . Recall 2-point homogeneous graphs are characterized by Macpherson [17] Theorem 1.2; from [17] p.63 Definition 1.1 and p.64 Paragraph 1, all these graphs, which are not a tree, are all Cayley graphs just described in this example. We thank R. Lyons for pointing these to us.

Clearly, there are many elements a of H with infinite order satisfying the requirement specified in Lemma 2.1. Let G_n be the $\langle a^n \rangle = \{a^{kn} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ left-coset Cayley graph. Then G_n converges locally to G as $n \rightarrow \infty$; and by Lemma 2.1, $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly nonamenable. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Recall the following lemma from [4].

Lemma 3.1 Assume $X = \{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a reversible irreducible Markov chain on a countable state space V with infinite stationary measure π and transition matrix P ; and the bottom of the spectrum of $I - P$ on $\ell^2(V, \pi)$ is $\lambda_1 > 0$. Let $A \subset V$ be nonempty with $\pi(A) < \infty$ and $\pi_A(\cdot) = \pi(A \cap \cdot) / \pi(A)$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_A}(X \text{ never return to } A) \geq \lambda_1,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_A}$ is the law of X with X_0 of the law π_A .

Let $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be an arbitrary nonamenable infinite transitive connected graph and $X = \{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ the SRW on it. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in V(H)$, let

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \geq 1 \mid X_t \notin B_H(X_1, n)\}.$$

For a subset $A \subset V(H)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, an edge (x, u) is (α, A, n) -nice if $x \in A$ and

$$\beta_{(x, u, j)} = \mathbb{P}[X_1 = u, X_{\tau_j} \notin A \mid X_0 = x] \geq \alpha, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Call $x \in A$ is (α, A, n) -nice if there is a (α, A, n) -nice edge (x, u) . Let d be the vertex degree of H .

Lemma 3.2 *Given any finite set $A \subset V(H)$, there are at least $\frac{\lambda_1(H)d}{2}|A|$ edges (x, u) which are $(\frac{\lambda_1(H)}{2}, A, n)$ -nice for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3.1,

$$\frac{1}{d|A|} \sum_{(x, u): x \in A} \mathbb{P}[X_1 = u, X_t \notin A, \forall t \geq 1 \mid X_0 = x] \geq \lambda_1(H).$$

Hence there are at least $\frac{\lambda_1(H)d}{2}|A|$ edges (x, u) with $x \in A$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 = u, X_t \notin A, \forall t \geq 1 \mid X_0 = x] \geq \lambda_1(H)/2.$$

This implies the lemma. ■

Lemma 3.3 $\forall \epsilon > 0, \epsilon_1 > 0$, there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$, for any $n \geq N$, $p_c(G_n) \leq p_c(G) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ be sufficiently small numbers with $p_c(G) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1 < 1$. Write $p = p_c(G) + \epsilon$. Let d be the vertex degree of G . Without loss of generality, assume each G_n is of vertex degree d . Put

$$r_n = \sup\{r \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : B_{G_n}(v_n, r) \cong B_G(v, r)\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where v_n (resp. v) is an arbitrary vertex of G_n (resp. G). Note r_n does not depend on v_n and v . Since G_n converges locally to G , we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \infty$. For convenience, we also assume vertex sets of each G_n and G are identical.

Step 1. Consider the bond percolation on G_n . For each edge e we consider three independent Bernoulli random variables, $X_e(p)$, $Y_e(\epsilon)$ and $Z_e(\epsilon_1)$ with means p , ϵ and ϵ_1 respectively. And the family $\{(X_e(p), Y_e(\epsilon), Z_e(\epsilon_1))\}_{e \in E(G_n)}$ is independent. An edge e is open if one of the three variables $X_e(p)$, $Y_e(\epsilon)$ and $Z_e(\epsilon_1)$ takes the value 1 and closed otherwise. An edge e is p -open if $X_e(p) = 1$, and ϵ -open if $Y_e(\epsilon) = 1$, and ϵ_1 -open if $Z_e(\epsilon_1) = 1$. So the probability of an edge being closed is $(1-p)(1-\epsilon)(1-\epsilon_1)$. Therefore, for a vertex $v \in V(G_n)$, the open cluster $C(v)$ of v , is dominated by $p_c(G) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1$ -bond percolation. In the following we will prove that with positive probability $|C(v)| = \infty$ for large enough n .

We will construct the following process, which produces an increasing sequence $\{A_t\}_t$ of connected vertex sets satisfying $A(t) \subseteq C(v)$ for all t . Let A_0 be the p -cluster of v . Call an edge ϵ -unchecked (resp. ϵ_1 -unchecked) if we don't know whether it is ϵ -open or ϵ -closed (resp. ϵ_1 -open or ϵ_1 -closed). Suppose A_0 is finite (otherwise the proof is completed) and all the edges touching A_0 are ϵ -unchecked and ϵ_1 -unchecked. For $t \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$ be the set of ϵ -unchecked edges (x, u) such that (x, u) is $(\frac{\lambda_1(G_n)}{2}, A_{t-1}, r_n)$ -nice. If $\mathcal{E}_{t-1} = \emptyset$, then stop the process. Otherwise, we choose some edge $(x, u) \in \mathcal{E}_{t-1}$ by some order and check whether the edge is ϵ -open or ϵ -closed. If it is closed, then let $A_t = A_{t-1}$. If not, we consider the p -percolation on $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ and the ϵ_1 -percolation on $B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \cap \partial_E A_{t-1}$. Here $\partial_E A_{t-1}$ is the set of edges with only one end in A_{t-1} . Let $\mathcal{V}_t$ be the set of following vertices in $B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \setminus A_{t-1}$:

Case 1. All vertices of any p -percolation path starting from u in $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ and not intersecting with A_{t-1} . Trivially, u is in $\mathcal{V}_t$.

Case 2. All vertices y of $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ such that there is a vertex $z \in B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \setminus A_{t-1}$ adjacent to A_{t-1} by an ϵ_1 -open edge e_z satisfying y is connected to z by a p -percolation path in $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ avoiding A_{t-1} . Here we don't need to know whether other edges sharing a vertex with e_z are ϵ_1 -open or not.

Let

$$A_t = A_{t-1} \cup \mathcal{V}_t.$$

Step 2. Given edge $(x, u) \in \mathcal{E}_{t-1}$. For any $y \in \partial B_{G_n}(u, j)$ with $j \leq r_n$, let

$$b_j(y, u, n) = \mathbb{P}_{G_n, p} [y \text{ is connected to } u \text{ in } B_{G_n}(u, j)].$$

Since $\delta := \mathbb{P}_{G, p} [u \text{ is connected to infinity}] > 0$ and $j \leq r_n$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{G_n, p} [u \text{ is connected to } \partial B_{G_n}(u, j) \text{ in } B_{G_n}(u, j)] \\ = \mathbb{P}_{G, p} [u \text{ is connected to } \partial B_G(u, j) \text{ in } B_G(u, j)] \geq \delta, \end{aligned}$$

and further

$$\sum_{y \in \partial B_{G_n}(u, j)} b_j(y, u, n) \geq \delta.$$

By Assumption 1.4(ii), there is a positive constant $c_3(p)$ depending on p such that for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$, any $j \leq r_n$ and any $A \subseteq \partial B_{G_n}(u, j)$ with $|A|/|\partial B_{G_n}(u, j)| \geq \eta$,

$$\sum_{y \in A} b_j(y, u, n) \geq c_3(p)\eta\delta. \quad (3.2)$$

By Assumption 1.4(i) and Lemma 3.2, conditioned on A_{t-1} and $(x, u) \in \mathcal{E}_{t-1}$, there is a positive constant c_4 independent of A_{t-1} and (x, u) such that for any $j \leq r_n$,

$$|\{y \in \partial B_{G_n}(u, j) : y \notin A_{t-1}\}| \geq c_4 \lambda_1(G_n) |\partial B_{G_n}(u, j)|. \quad (3.3)$$

Step 3. Define

$$Z_t = |\{e : e \text{ is an } \epsilon\text{-closed and } \epsilon\text{-checked edge touching } A_t\}|.$$

Let

$$\tau = \min \left\{ t : |A_t| \leq \frac{2t}{\lambda_1(G_n)d} \right\}.$$

Note that we only check the ϵ -status of one edge at each step, thus $Z_t \leq t$. By Lemma 3.2, if $|A_t| > \frac{2t}{\lambda_1(G_n)d}$, then there exists at least one ϵ -unchecked edge. Let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the σ -algebra generated by the p , ϵ and ϵ_1 statuses of the edges up to time t and $\xi_t = |A_{t+1}| - |A_t|$.

By the definition of $\mathcal{V}_t$, we have that for any vertex $y \in \partial B_{G_n}(u, j) \setminus A_{t-1}$ with $j \leq r_n$,

$$\mathbb{P}[y \in \mathcal{V}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \geq \epsilon_1 b_j(y, u, n). \quad (3.4)$$

Indeed, fix A_{t-1} and (x, u) , and consider the p -bond percolation $\omega(u, n)$ on edges of $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ which do not touch A_{t-1} . Let

$$\partial^+ A_{t-1} = \{y \in G_n \setminus A_{t-1} : \exists z \in A_{t-1}, y \sim z\}, \quad B_t = \partial^+ A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n).$$

For any $y \in B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \setminus (A_{t-1} \cup \{u\})$, let $D_t(y) = \{y \text{ is connected to } B_t \text{ in } \omega(u, n)\}$ and

$$D_t^1(y) = \{y \text{ is connected to } u \text{ with an open path avoiding } A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \text{ in } \omega(u, n)\},$$

$$D_t^2(y) = D_t(y) \setminus D_t^1(y).$$

When $D_t^1(y)$ holds, y is in $\mathcal{V}_t$. And when $D_t^2(y)$ holds, there must be an open path connecting y with a vertex $z \in B_t \setminus \{u\}$ and avoiding A_{t-1} in $\omega(u, n)$; assume $z \sim w \in A_{t-1}$ and let edge zw be ϵ_1 -open, then $y \in \mathcal{V}_t$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[y \in \mathcal{V}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] &\geq \mathbb{P}[D_t^1(y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] + \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}[D_t^2(y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \\ &\geq \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}[D_t(y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t]. \end{aligned}$$

Extend $\omega(u, n)$ to a p -bond percolation $\tilde{\omega}(u, n)$ on $B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ by letting edges touching $A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$ be p -open independently and independent of all $X.(p)$, $Y.(e)$ and $Z.(\epsilon_1)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} F_t(y) &= \{y \text{ is connected to } u \text{ in } \tilde{\omega}(u, n)\}, \\ F_t^1(y) &= \{y \text{ is connected to } u \text{ by an open path avoiding } A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n) \text{ in } \tilde{\omega}(u, n)\}, \\ F_t^2(y) &= F_t(y) \setminus F_t^1(y). \end{aligned}$$

Then $F_t^1(y) = D_t^1(y)$.

Now assume $F_t^2(y)$ holds. Then there must be an open path $\gamma = (y_0 y_1 \cdots y_i)$ in $\tilde{\omega}(u, n)$ such that $y_0 = y$, $y_i = u$ and some $y_j \in A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$. Let

$$j_* = \min \{1 \leq j \leq i : y_j \in A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n)\}.$$

Clearly $1 \leq j_* < i$. When $j_* > 1$, $(y_0 y_1 \cdots y_{j_*-1})$ is an open path in $\tilde{\omega}(u, n)$ avoiding $A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$; hence it is also an open path in $\omega(u, n)$ avoiding $A_{t-1} \cap B_{G_n}(u, r_n)$. Combining with $y_{j_*-1} \in B_t$ when $j_* > 1$, we see $D_t^2(y)$ holds. In addition, when $j_* = 1$, clearly $D_t^2(y)$ holds. Therefore,

$$F_t^2(y) \subseteq D_t^2(y).$$

And further

$$F_t(y) \subseteq D_t(y).$$

So we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[y \in \mathcal{V}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] &\geq \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}[D_t(y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \\ &\geq \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}[F_t(y) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \\ &= \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}^{\tilde{\omega}(u, n)}[F_t(y)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\tilde{\omega}(u, n)}$ is the law of $\tilde{\omega}(u, n)$, and we have used that $\tilde{\omega}(u, n)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ given $\tau > t$ and $(x, u) \in \mathcal{E}_{t-1}$. This implies (3.4).

Now by (3.2)-(3.4),

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \geq \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \epsilon_1 \sum_{y \in \partial B_{G_n}(u, j) \setminus A_{t-1}} b_j(y, u, n) \geq \epsilon_1 c_4 \lambda_1(G_n) c_3(p) c_4 \lambda_1(G_n) \delta r_n. \quad (3.5)$$

Step 4. Note by the uniform nonamenability of $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, we have $\inf_{k \geq 1} \lambda_1(G_k) > 0$. Hence, for large enough n , by (3.5),

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau > t] \geq 4d^{-1} \lambda_1(G_n)^{-1}.$$

Let $X_i = \sum_{j=0}^i (\xi_j - \mathbb{E}(\xi_j))$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Note the randomness of ξ_{i+1} is independent of $\mathcal{F}_i$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{i+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_i) = X_i + \mathbb{E}(\xi_{i+1} - \mathbb{E}(\xi_{i+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_i) = X_i;$$

and $\{X_i\}_i$ is a martingale. Clearly, for any i , $|X_{i+1} - X_i| \leq d(d-1)^{r_n}$. When n is large enough, by the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality ([1] Chapter 7), for any $t > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau = t+1 | |A_0| < \infty) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|A_0| + \sum_{i=0}^t \xi_i \leq \frac{2(t+1)}{d\lambda_1(G_n)} \mid |A_0| < \infty\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^t \xi_i - \sum_{i=0}^t \mathbb{E}(\xi_i) \leq \frac{2(t+1)}{d\lambda_1(G_n)} \mid |A_0| < \infty\right) \leq e^{-c_5(t+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_5 := 2\lambda_1(G_n)^{-2}d^{-4}(d-1)^{-2r_n} > 0$. For any $K \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a positive probability with $|A_0| \geq K$, thus for K large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau = \infty) &\geq \mathbb{P}(|A_0| \geq K) \mathbb{P}(\tau = \infty | |A_0| \geq K) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(|A_0| \geq K) \left[1 - \sum_{t \geq \frac{\lambda_1(G_n)dK}{2}} e^{-c_5(t+1)} \right] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that $\tau > \frac{\lambda_1(G_n)d|A_0|}{2}$ due to $|A_t|$ is increasing. Clearly, $\{\tau = \infty\}$ implies $\{|C(v)| = \infty\}$. Hence, there is a positive probability of an infinite cluster in $p_c(G) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1$ -bond percolation on G_n . That is $p_c(G_n) \leq p_c(G) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1$. ■

Similarly to Lemma 3.3, one can prove

Lemma 3.4 *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$, when n is large enough, $p_c(G) \leq p_c(G_n) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_1$.*

By Lemmas 3.3-3.4, or Lemma 3.3 and (1.1), we obtain Theorem 1.5 immediately. ■

Remark 3.5 *Notice (3.1) and (3.5). From the proof of Theorem 1.5, the following holds: For any sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to a nonamenable transitive infinite connected graph G , if*

$$G \text{ satisfies Assumption 1.4 and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(G_n)^2 r_n = \infty,$$

then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_c(G_n) = p_c(G)$.

4 Problems

Let $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to a transitive infinite connected graph H . Fix vertex v (resp. v_n) of H (resp. H_n). Consider a copy $\tilde{H}_n$ of H_n on vertex set $V(H)$ such that

$$B_{\tilde{H}_n}(v, r_n) = B_H(v, r_n) \text{ with } r_n = \sup \{r \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : B_{H_n}(v_n, r) \cong B_H(v, r)\}.$$

Since H_n converges locally to H , we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \infty$. Let P (resp. P_n) be the transition matrix of the SRW on H (resp. $\tilde{H}_n$). Then P_n converges to P pointwisely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Notice

$$\lambda_1(H) = \inf_{f \in \ell^2(V(H)) \setminus \{0\}} \langle f, (I - P)f \rangle / \langle f, f \rangle, \quad \lambda_1(H_n) = \inf_{f \in \ell^2(V(H)) \setminus \{0\}} \langle f, (I - P_n)f \rangle / \langle f, f \rangle.$$

It is easy to prove

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(H_n) \leq \lambda_1(H). \quad (4.1)$$

Generally $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(H_n) = \lambda_1(H)$ may not hold. A natural question is

Problem 4.1 *Given any transitive infinite connected graph H . (i) Is there a nontrivial sequence $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of uniformly nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to H when it is nonamenable? (ii) Is there a nontrivial sequence $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of amenable transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to amenable H with $p_c(H) < 1$ satisfying that $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(H_n) < 1$?*

See Section 2 for partial positive answers to Problem 4.1(i). Recall that every finitely generated infinite group with free group F_2 as a subgroup is nonamenable; and the Burnside group

$$B(m, n) = \langle g_1, \dots, g_m \mid g_i^n = 1, \forall i \rangle$$

is nonamenable and does not contain F_2 as a subgroup for any $m \geq 2$ and odd $n \geq 665$; and grandparent graphs are not isomorphic to any Cayley graph, and are transitive and nonamenable. And as a transitive graph which is not quasi-isometric to any Cayley graph ([12]), the Diestel-Leader graph $DL(k, \ell)$ is nonamenable iff $k \neq \ell$. Therefore, there are plenty of typical examples for studying Problem 4.1(i).

Notice any quotient graph of an amenable graph is amenable. And for a finitely generated infinite group, there may not be an element of infinite-order generally. When H is a Cayley graph of an amenable finitely generated infinite group $\Gamma = \langle S \mid R \rangle$ with an element r of infinite order, then Cayley graph H_n of $\langle S \mid R, r^n \rangle$ converges locally to H ; and to answer affirmatively Problem 4.1(ii), we need (a) each H_n is infinite, and (b) $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(H_n) < 1$. Clearly (a) is easy usually when $p_c(H) < 1$. But (b) might be difficult in some cases. In addition, we point out that solvable groups and groups with subexponential growth are amenable.

For a sequence $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of uniformly nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs, clearly $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(H_n) < 1$. Conversely, for a sequence $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of nonamenable transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to a nonamenable transitive infinite connected graph with $\sup_{n \geq 1} p_c(H_n) < 1$, is the sequence uniformly nonamenable? Maybe the answer is negative.

In addition, the following problem is fundamental:

Problem 4.2 *What kind of transitive infinite connected graphs satisfy Assumption 1.4(i) or Assumption 1.4(ii) or Assumption 1.4?*

Assumption 1.4(i) means harmonic measures (exiting distributions) $\mu_n(\cdot)$ on $\partial B_G(u, n)$ are roughly uniform. Recall Pete [21] Section 9.5 proposed the following rough uniformity problem for finitely generated groups: *Does every finitely generated group have a generating set in which harmonic measures $\mu_n(\cdot)$ on $\partial B_G(u, n)$ are roughly uniform in the sense that there exist constants $0 < c, C < \infty$ such that for any n , there is $U_n \subseteq \partial B_G(u, n)$ satisfying*

$$\mu_n(U_n) > c, \quad c < \frac{\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(y)} < C \text{ for all } x, y \in U_n?$$

Note Graphs specified in examples of Section 2 are hyperbolic and have an infinite hyperbolic boundary. Recall every hyperbolic transitive graph with infinite hyperbolic boundary is nonamenable ([23] Chapter 4 Section 22). We conjecture that Assumption 1.4 holds for quasi-spherically symmetric transitive graphs. As for hyperbolic transitive graphs of infinite hyperbolic boundary (e.g., d -regular infinite hyperbolic tiling with $d \geq 5$), R. Lyons thinks this is not true for either Assumption 1.4(i) or Assumption 1.4(ii), and the problem is that differences build up multiplicatively from u to the boundary of the ball. For the same reason, he doubt Pete's question has a positive answer, and like wise for the following Problem 4.4. However for d -regular infinite hyperbolic tiling with $d \geq 5$, we believe that we can prove Problem 4.4(ii) has a positive answer, which we plan to do in another paper.

I. Benjamini suggests us that not for application, still it might be of interests to look at $f(r)$ -quasi spherical symmetry. That is, bound the number of pieces one should cut an r -sphere in Cayley graph so that the harmonic measure ratio is say bounded by 2 in each piece. Assumption 1.4 might be true

for some general $f(r)$ -quasi spherically symmetric transitive infinite graphs.

From the proof of Theorem 1.5, what we really need is the following: *There is a positive constant c_6 such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \leq r_n$ and any $A \subseteq \partial B_G(u, j)$ with $\mu_j(A) \geq \lambda_1(G_n)/2$,*

$$\sum_{y \in A} b_j(y, u, n) \geq c_6. \quad (4.2)$$

If (4.2) holds, then similarly to Theorem 1.5, we can verify that without Assumption 1.4, Theorem 1.5 does still hold. To prove Conjecture 1.2 in the uniformly nonamenable setting, the following problem should be studied.

Problem 4.3 *Let G be a nonamenable transitive infinite connected graph. Is there a positive constant c such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $A \subseteq \partial B_G(u, n)$ with $\mu_n(A) \geq \lambda_1(G)/2$,*

$$\sum_{y \in A} b_n(y, u) \geq c?$$

Furthermore, we can propose the following asymptotically absolutely continuous problem:

Problem 4.4 *Let G be a nonamenable transitive infinite connected graph and each ν_n the uniform probability on $\partial B_G(u, n)$. (i) Is μ_n (resp. $b_n(\cdot, u)$) asymptotically absolutely continuous with respect to ν_n in the sense that for any $A_n \subseteq \partial B_G(u, n)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(A_n) = 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A_n) = 0 \quad \left(\text{resp.} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{y \in A_n} b_n(y, u) = 0 \right)?$$

(ii) *Is μ_n asymptotically absolutely continuous with respect to $b_n(\cdot, u)$ in the sense that for any $A_n \subseteq \partial B_G(u, n)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{y \in A_n} b_n(y, u) = 0$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A_n) = 0$?*

Affirmative answer to Problem 4.4(i) or Problem 4.4(ii) can be used to prove Conjecture 1.2 in the uniformly nonamenable case similarly to Theorem 1.5.

Notice $\mathbb{Z}$ is an amenable 2-regular spherically symmetric infinite transitive graph and all examples for quasi-spherically symmetric infinite transitive graphs in Section 2 are nonamenable; naturally the following problem arises:

Problem 4.5 *Are there amenable quasi-spherically symmetric infinite transitive connected graphs with degree at least 3?*

Finally, the following locality problem is very interesting in its own way. Let

$$p_u(G) = \inf \{p \in [0, 1] : \mathbb{P}_{G,p}(\exists \text{ an unique infinite component}) > 0\}.$$

Recall [5] conjectured that $p_c(G) < p_u(G)$ for any nonamenable quasi-transitive infinite connected graph G ; and this conjecture holds in some cases ([16]).

Problem 4.6 *Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of transitive infinite connected graphs converging locally to a transitive infinite connected graph G . (i) Does $p_u(G_n) \rightarrow p_u(G)$ when each G_n and G are nonamenable? (ii) Under what conditions, $\theta_{G_n}(p) \rightarrow \theta_G(p)$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ or $\theta_{G_n}(\cdot) \rightarrow \theta_G(\cdot)$ in the Skorohod (resp. uniform) topology for Càdlàg (resp. continuous) functions on $[0, 1]$?*

Acknowledgements. Song He is indebted to Professors R. Lyons and V. Sidoravicius for useful discussions during ICM2014, Seoul. The authors are very grateful to Professor G. Kozma for pointing out several mistakes in their manuscript, and to Professors I. Benjamini and R. Lyons for helpful comments and suggestions. These improve greatly the quality of the paper.

References

- [1] N. Alon, J. H. Spencer. (2008). *The probabilistic method* (3rd edition). Wiley, New York.
- [2] A. Akhmedov. (2005). The girth of groups satisfying Tits Alternative. *J. Algebra*. **287**(2), 275-282.
- [3] I. Benjamini. (2013). *Coarse geometry and randomness*. Lecture notes from the 41st Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2011. Lect. Notes Math., **2100**. Springer, Cham.
- [4] I. Benjamini, A. Nachmias, Y. Peres. (2011). Is the critical percolation probability local? *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*. **149**(1-2), 261-269.
- [5] I. Benjamini, O. Schramm. (1996). Percolation beyond $\mathbb{Z}^d$, many questions and a few answers. *Electron. Comm. Probab.* **1**, 71-82.
- [6] I. Benjamini, O. Schramm. (1996). Harmonic functions on planar and almost planar graphs and manifolds, via circle packings. *Invent. Math.* **126**, 565-587.
- [7] I. Benjamini, O. Schramm. (2001). Percolation in the hyperbolic plane. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **29**, 487-507.
- [8] N. Delfosse, G. Zémor. (2014). A homological upper bound on critical probabilities for hyperbolic percolation. arXiv: 1408.4031v1 [math.PR]. Available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1408.4031.pdf>.
- [9] R. Diestel. (2010). *Graph theory* (4th edition). Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **173**. Springer, Heidelberg.
- [10] J. Dodziuk. (1984). Difference equations, isoperimetric inequality and transience of certain random walks. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **284**(2), 787-794.
- [11] H. Duminil-Copin, V. Sidoravicius, V. Tassion. (2014). Absence of infinite cluster for critical Bernoulli percolation on slabs. arXiv: 1401.7130v1 [math.PR]. Available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1401.7130.pdf>.
- [12] A. Eskin, D. Fisher, K. Whyte. (2013). Coarse differentiation of quasi-isometries II: Rigidity for Sol and lamplighter groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*. **177**(3), 869-910.
- [13] G. R. Grimmett, J. M. Marstrand. (1990). The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved. *Proc. R. Soc. London. Ser. A*. **430**(1879), 439-457.
- [14] J. M. Hammersley. (1957). Percolation processes II. The connective constant. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **53**, 642-659.
- [15] T. Hara, G. Slade. (1990). Mean-field critical behaviour for percolation in high dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **128**(2), 333-391.
- [16] R. Lyons, Y. Peres. (2014). *Probability on trees and networks*. (<http://mypage.iu.edu/~rdlyons>). Book in preparation.
- [17] H. D. Macpherson. (1982). Infinite distance transitive graphs of finite valency. *Combinatorica* **2**(1), 63-69.
- [18] S. Martineau, V. Tassion. (2013). Locality of percolation for abelian Cayley graphs. arXiv: 1312.1946v1 [math.PR]. Available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.1946v1.pdf>.
- [19] G. Medolla, P. M. Soardi. (1995). Extensions of Foster's averaging formula to infinite networks with moderate growth. *Math. Z.* **219**, 171-186.
- [20] A. Y. Olshanskii, M. V. Sapir. (2009). On F_k -like groups. *Algebra i Logika*. **48**(2), 245-257.

- [21] G. Pete. (2014). *Probability and geometry on groups*. Lecture notes for a graduate course. (<http://www.math.bme.hu/~gabor>). Book in preparation.
- [22] B. Wajnryb, P. Witowicz. (2014). Richard Thompson group F is not amenable. arXiv: 1408.2188v2 [math.GR]. Available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1408.2188.pdf>.
- [23] W. Woess. (2000). *Random walk on infinite graphs and groups*. Cambridge University Press.